Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/664,890	HARASHIMA, HAJIME
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Leonid Kravets	2189
All Participants:	Status of Application:	
(1) <u>Leonid Kravets</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Howard Bernstein</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: <u>11 October 2005</u>	Time: <u>2:00pm</u>	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant ☐ Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	ant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed: 10-11		
Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENE See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WA	S DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summa 	ne examiner will provide a writt record of the substance of the	ten summary of the substance interview, since the interview
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicar	nt/Applicant's Representative S	Signature - if appropriate)

Application No. 10/664,890

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner's makes of record that attempts to reach the attorney of record, Mr. Osha failed as he is now deceased. The call to Mr. Osha's law firm was returned by attorney Mr. Howard Bernstein. Questions discussed revolved around claim interpretation. Examiner was seeking to clarify text of claims 10 and 11. Specifically, whether claim 10 is supposed to look like claim 5 and a clarification of the language of claim 11, 2nd paragraph. Mr. Bernstein faxed the questions to the applicant.